UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,215	11/01/2001	Matthias Breuer	P-5801	4121

7590 05/10/2005

Forrest Gunnison
Gunnison, McKay & Hodgson, L.L.P.
Suite 220
1900 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940

EXAMINER	
PAULA, CESAR B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/002,215	BREUER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5-16,19,20 and 23-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-2,5-16, 19-20, and 23-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment, and IDS filed on 12/30/2004.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 3-4, 17-18, and 21-22 have been canceled. Claims 1-2, 5-16, 19-20, and 23-28 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, 19, 27, and 28 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 12/30/2004 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Priority

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and based on applications # 01 109 921.5, and 00 123 924.3 filed at the EPO on 4/24/2001, and 11/3/2000 respectively, which papers have been placed of record in the file. However, it is noted, however, that applicant has not filed certified copies of the applications above as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b). Applicants have indicated that the certified copies will be submitted under a separate response (page 10, remarks filed on 12/30/2004).

Drawings

5. The drawings filed on 11/1/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-10, 14, 19-24, and 27-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ammirato et al, hereinafter Ammirato (Pat.# 5,499,180, 3/12/1996, as disclosed in IDS filed on 9/3/2002).

Regarding independent claim 1, Ammirato discloses a user setting of a baseline spreadsheet version—*first test mode* for testing spreadsheet results-- which is to be compared with different spreadsheet versions or scenarios of the spreadsheet by changing certain of the values in certain changing cells found in the baseline version scenario--*while in said first test mode*. Several scenarios or versions are created, which are then compared with a base version of a spreadsheet document (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B). In this case, the scenarios for creating the spreadsheet versions are included, or are part of the root scenario, for creating the baseline spreadsheet version—*said second test mode is nested within said first test mode* --, which is needed to produce different versions of variations of the same base spreadsheet.

Moreover, Ammirato discloses a user setting of a baseline spreadsheet, by taking a snapshot of a data model using a capture button—*automatically storing a first test mode data set at the time of said activating said first test mode* (col.9, lines 28-46).

Moreover, Ammirato discloses the creation of a new scenario by changing a value for a cell—*changing data in the document data set in response of new data, activating, in response to another user request, a second test mode* (col.9, lines 43-67, fig.5B).

In addition, Ammirato discloses a user creates a new version of the base spreadsheet, by changing the value of a first cell, and changing other related cells as a result of the change in the first cell—*automatically storing a second test mode data set at the time of said activating said first test mode and changing data in the document data set in response to input of other new data* (col.9, lines 28-46).

Furthermore, Ammirato discloses generating reports summarizing scenarios generated by the user—*restoring the second and first test modes data set upon leaving the first and second test modes* (col.9, lines 28-46). In other words, when the user presses the reports button the modes are exited and the information from the scenarios are stored again in a different area or report summary.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Ammirato discloses the creation of several scenarios or versions, which are then compared with a base version of a spreadsheet document (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B). In this case, the different scenarios branch off—*more than two nested test nodes available*-- the base spreadsheet to produce different versions of variations of the same base spreadsheet.

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Ammirato discloses the creation of several scenarios or versions, which are then compared with a base version of a spreadsheet document (col.9, lines 20-46, fig. 5B).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Ammirato discloses the creation of several scenarios or versions, which are then compared with a base version of a spreadsheet document (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Ammirato discloses the creation of several scenarios or versions, by inputting different cell values—*formatting options*-- into each of the versions, which are then compared with a base version of a spreadsheet document (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Ammirato discloses the creation of a single report containing each of the several scenarios or versions—*all test mode data sets are stored and accessible upon user request*, which are then compared with a base version of a spreadsheet document (col.9, lines 20-46, and col.10, lines 66-col.11, line 16, fig. 5B).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Ammirato discloses the creation of several scenarios or versions—*recognizing, and storing an order of creation*--, starting out with a base

version, which is compared with modified versions or scenarios of itself (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 9, Ammirato discloses the editing of scenarios until a desired result is reached (col.10, lines 16-67, fig. 5B). In other words, the user changes the scenarios back and forth—*movement forward and backward*-- until the desired outcome is obtained.

Claim 14 is directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 19-20, 23-24 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1-2, 5-10 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 27 is directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable medium for storing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 28 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claims 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 11-13, 15-18, and 25-26 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ammirato, in view of Jamshidi et al, hereinafter Jamshidi (Pat. # 6,631,497, 10/7/2003, filed on 7/19/1999).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 10, Ammirato discloses the creation of several scenarios or versions, starting out with a base version, which is compared with modified versions or scenarios of itself (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B). Ammirato fails to explicitly disclose *arranging said stored test mode data as a tree structure.*. However, Jamshidi teaches displaying spreadsheet/table models in a tree structure (col.7, lines 4-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ammirato, and Jamshidi, because Jamshidi teaches a friendly interface that provides a spreadsheet user with the ability to view the entire distributed environment (col. 2, lines 40-47). This combination thus provide the benefit of an efficient and seamless way of viewing the spreadsheet and its contents.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 11, Ammirato discloses the creation of several scenarios or versions, starting out with a base version, which is compared with modified versions or scenarios of itself (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B). Ammirato fails to explicitly disclose *displaying the tree structure on a display medium, and enabling the user to select a particular test mode.* However, Jamshidi teaches displaying spreadsheet/table models in a tree structure,

where users can select, and drag and drop elements between the spreadsheet, and the tree structure (col.7, lines 4-32, and fig. 3-4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ammirato, and Jamshidi, because Jamshidi teaches a friendly interface that provides a spreadsheet user with the ability to view the entire distributed environment (col. 2, lines 40-47). This combination thus provide the benefit of an efficient and seamless way of viewing the spreadsheet and its contents.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 10, Ammirato discloses the creation of several scenarios or versions, starting out with a base version, which is compared with modified versions or scenarios of itself (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B). Ammirato fails to explicitly disclose *assigning an identification to each branching point of the tree structure, wherein said each branching point represents one of said test mode data sets*. However, Jamshidi teaches displaying spreadsheet/table models in a tree structure, displaying different views as child nodes- - *each branching point represents one of said test mode data sets* (col.7, lines 4-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ammirato, and Jamshidi, because Jamshidi teaches a friendly interface that provides a spreadsheet user with the ability to view the entire distributed environment (col. 2, lines 40-47). This combination thus provide the benefit of an efficient and seamless way of viewing the spreadsheet and its contents.

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Ammirato discloses the creation of several scenarios or versions, starting out with a base version, which is compared with modified

versions or scenarios of itself (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B). Ammirato fails to explicitly disclose *displaying, in response to yet another user request a tree structure on a display medium wherein said tree structure represents test mode data sets.*. However, Jamshidi teaches displaying spreadsheet/table models in a tree structure (col.7, lines 4-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ammirato, and Jamshidi, because Jamshidi teaches a friendly interface that provides a spreadsheet user with the ability to view the entire distributed environment (col. 2, lines 40-47). This combination thus provide the benefit of an efficient and seamless way of viewing the spreadsheet and its contents.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 15, Ammirato discloses the creation of several scenarios or versions, starting out with a base version, which is compared with modified versions or scenarios of itself (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B). Ammirato fails to explicitly disclose *restoring a user selected test mode data set in said tree structure.* However, Jamshidi teaches displaying spreadsheet/table models in a tree structure (col.7, lines 4-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ammirato, and Jamshidi, because Jamshidi teaches a friendly interface that provides a spreadsheet user with the ability to view the entire distributed environment (col. 2, lines 40-47). This combination thus provide the benefit of an efficient and seamless way of viewing the spreadsheet and its contents.

Claims 25-26 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 11-12 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 12/30/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants remark that the Examiner cited no teaching of starting a second test mode while in a first mode (page 10). Regarding claims 1, 14, 19, and 27-28, the Examiner disagrees, because Ammirato discloses a user setting of a baseline spreadsheet version—*first test mode* for testing spreadsheet results-- which is to be compared with different spreadsheet versions or scenarios of the spreadsheet by changing certain of the values in certain changing cells found in the baseline version scenario--*while in said first test mode.* Several scenarios or versions are created, which are then compared with a base version of a spreadsheet document (col.9, lines 20-67, fig. 5B).

Moreover, Applicants also remark that "restoring the baseline spreadsheet, fails to teach or suggest restoring the second test mode data set in which returns to the state in the first test mode when the second test mode was activated, which is different from the baseline in view of changing data in the document data set in response to input of new data. Thus, Ammirato fails to teach multiple elements recited in the Claims" (page 11, para.3). The Examiner disagrees, because Ammirato discloses generating reports summarizing scenarios generated by the user—*restoring the second and first test modes data set upon leaving the first and second test modes* (col.9, lines 28-46). In other words, when the user presses the reports button the modes are exited and the information from the scenarios are stored again—*restoring*-- in a different area or report summary.

Dependent claims 2, 5-13, 15-18, 20, 23, 24-26 remain rejected at least for the same rationale set forth above concerning claims 1, and 19 above.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306,** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
5/9/05